

Evaluation Instruments

COMMUNITY

1. Construct: **Sense of Community**
2. Name and Description of Instrument/Scale: **Sense of Community Index (SCI)**
3. Construct Operational Definition as used in Instrument: Measures an individual's psychological sense of community. There are four dimensions measures by the instrument: membership, influence, reinforcement of needs, and shared emotional connection.
4. Reliability: Reported reliability by Pretty, et. al. (1994): Two separate studies were reported, one giving the index of a reliability coefficient of .72 and the other giving it a reliability coefficient of .78.

Also found: Pretty, et. al.: (1990). Coefficient of .71;
Perkins, et. al, (1990). Coefficient of .80; and
Pretty and McCarthy (1991). Coefficient of .69
5. Validity: Not Available
6. Target Population: Urban Populations all ages
7. Populations instrument has been used with and associated psychometric data: Age Group/Ethnic Group/Gender/Geographic

Instrument has been used with the Aurban block [@] being the community referent - Urban neighborhood in Nashville.

Instrument has been adapted to other concepts of 'sense of community' by replacing 'block' with 'school' - Older high school students surveyed while in class.
8. Respondent: Self
9. Ease of use/scoring: True=1, False=0. There are four dimensions and questions in these dimensions are added together.
10. Number of items in scale: 12
11. Mode of Administration: Pencil and Paper self report
12. Strength of relationship to ATOD and other problem behaviors: Studies measures social support and loneliness, in relation to sense of community.
13. Source: David M. Chavis, Ph.D., (301) 519-0722

14. Author: David M. Chavis, (301) 519-0722
15. Availability: Contact Dr. Chavis
16. Cost: None
17. Copyright: None
18. Citation Information (abstracts, where used)

Chavis, D.M., et. al. (1990)
Florin, P., et. al. (1990)
McMillian, D.W., and Chavis, D.M., (1986)
Perkins, D., et. al. (1990)
Pretty, G.H., et. al. (1990)
Pretty, G.H., et. al. (1991)
Pretty, G.H., et. al. (1994)

COMMUNITY

Sense of Community Index:

I am going to read some statements that people might make about their [block]. Each time I read one of these statements, please tell me if it is mostly true or mostly false about your [block] simply by saying 'true' or 'false.'

True = 1

False = 0

- Q1. I think my [block] is a good place for me to live.
- Q2. People on this [block] do not share the same values.
- Q3. My [neighbors] and I want the same things from the [block].
- Q4. I can recognize most of the people who live on my [block].
- Q5. I feel at home on this [block].
- Q6. Very few of my [neighbors] know me.
- Q7. I care about what my [neighbors] think of my actions.
- Q8. I have no influence over what this [block] is like.
- Q9. If there is a problem on this [block] people who live here can get it solved.
- Q10. It is very important to me to live on this particular [block].
- Q11. People on this [block] generally don't get along with each other.
- Q12. I expect to live on this [block] for a long time.

Total Sense of Community Index = Total Q1 through Q12

Subscales: Membership=Q4+Q5+Q6
 Influence=Q7+Q8+Q9
 Reinforcement of Needs=Q1+Q2+Q3
 Shared Emotional Connection-Q10+Q11+Q12

*Scores for Q2, Q6, Q8, & Q11 need to be reversed before scoring.

COMMUNITY

1. Construct: **Perceived Availability of Drugs and Handguns**
2. Name and Description of Instrument/Scale: **Student Survey of Risk and Protective Factors/Perceived Availability of Drugs and Handguns**
3. Construct Operational Definition as used in Instrument:
4. Reliability: 0.84
5. Validity: High concurrent validity with drug and alcohol use and delinquency.
6. Target Population: General population of students in 6, 8, 10 and 12
7. Populations instrument has been used with and associated psychometric data:
Age Group/Ethnic Group/Gender/Geographic

Normed with different ethnic populations
8. Respondent: Self
9. Ease of use/scoring: Four-point scale (NO! To YES!)
10. Number of items in scale: 5
11. Mode of Administration: Pencil and Paper self report
12. Strength of relationship to ATOD and other problem behaviors:
13. Source: Contact Author or CSAP Project Officer
14. Author: Arthur, Hawkins, Catalano and Pollard
15. Availability: Public Domain
16. Cost: None
17. Copyright: Public Domain
18. Citation Information (abstracts, where used)

Pollard, J.A., et. al. (Unpublished).
Pollard, J.A. et. al. (1988).

COMMUNITY

Perceived Availability of Drugs and Handguns Scale:

1. If you wanted to get some beer, wine, or hard liquor (for example, vodka, whiskey or gin), how easy would it be for you to get some?

___ Very hard ___ Sort of hard ___ Sort of easy ___ Very easy

2. If you wanted to get some cigarettes, how easy would it be for you to get some?

___ Very hard ___ Sort of hard ___ Sort of easy ___ Very easy

3. If you wanted to get some marijuana, how easy would it be for you to get some?

___ Very hard ___ Sort of hard ___ Sort of easy ___ Very easy

4. If you wanted to get a drug like, cocaine, LSD, or amphetamines, how easy would it be for you to get some?

___ Very hard ___ Sort of hard ___ Sort of easy ___ Very easy

5. If you wanted to get a handgun, how easy would it be for you to get one?

___ Very hard ___ Sort of hard ___ Sort of easy ___ Very easy

COMMUNITY

1. Construct: **Neighborhood Attachment**
2. Name and Description of Instrument/Scale: **Student Survey of Risk and Protective Factors/Neighborhood Attachment**
3. Construct Operational Definition as used in Instrument: Respondent's perception of how easy it would be to obtain alcohol, cigarettes, marijuana, other illicit drugs or handguns.
4. Reliability: 0.88
5. Validity: Correlations between .25 and .45 with measures of ATOD use and other antisocial behavior.
6. Target Population: General population of students in 6, 8, 10 and 12
7. Populations instrument has been used with and associated psychometric data: Age Group/Ethnic Group/Gender/Geographic

Statewide representative samples of 6th-12th grade students in more than 20 States. Reliabilities and correlation coefficients with outcome measures vary little across grade, gender, and ethnic groups, including European-American, African-American, Hispanic, and Asian/Pacific Islander.
8. Respondent: Self
9. Ease of use/scoring: Very easy, Five-item scale. Items can be averaged to create a scale score.
10. Number of items in scale: 3
11. Mode of Administration: Pencil and Paper self report
12. Strength of relationship to ATOD and other problem behaviors: Correlations indicate moderate relationship with ATOD use and related problem behaviors.
13. Source: Contact Author or Developmental Research and Programs, Inc.
130 Nickerson Street, #107. Seattle, Washington, 98119. Phone:
(206) 286-1805. Scannable survey forms, instructions for
administration,
scanning and analytic reports for a fee.

14. Author: Arthur, Hawkins, Catalano and Pollard
15. Availability: Public Domain
16. Cost: None. Additional services provided for a fee.
17. Copyright: Public Domain
18. Citation Information (abstracts, where used)

Hawkins. J.D., (1997). (Unpublished)

Pollard, J.A. et. al. (1998).

COMMUNITY

Neighborhood Attachment Scale:

- | | | | | | |
|----|--|-----|----|-----|------|
| 1. | I'd like to get out of my neighborhood. | NO! | no | yes | YES! |
| 2. | I like my neighborhood. | NO! | no | yes | YES! |
| 3. | If I had to move, I would miss the neighborhood I now live in. | NO! | no | yes | YES! |

COMMUNITY

1. Construct: **Social Disorganization**
2. Name and Description of Instrument/Scale: **Student Survey of Risk and Protective Factors/Social Disorganization**
3. Construct Operational Definition as used in Instrument: The presence of threatening or anti-social behavior, signs of economic and aesthetic decay, and signs of a lack of community supervision.
4. Reliability: 0.80
5. Validity: High concurrent validity with drug and alcohol use and delinquency.
6. Target Population: General population of students in 6, 8, 10 and 12
7. Populations instrument has been used with and associated psychometric data:
Age Group/Ethnic Group/Gender/Geographic
Normed with different ethnic populations
8. Respondent: Self
9. Ease of use/scoring: Two questions and five items (NO! To YES!). The first question is a bit awkward in its wording and may lead to some confusion in respondents.
10. Number of items in scale: 5
11. Mode of Administration: Pencil and Paper self report
12. Strength of relationship to ATOD and other problem behaviors:
13. Source: Contact Author or CSAP Project Officer
14. Author: Arthur, Hawkins, Catalano and Pollard
15. Availability: Public Domain
16. Cost: None
17. Copyright: Public Domain
18. Citation Information (abstracts, where used)
Pollard, J.A., et. al. (Unpublished).
Pollard, J.A., et. al. (1998).

COMMUNITY

Social Disorganization Scale:

How much do each of the following statements describe your neighborhood:

1. Crime and/or drug selling.

NO! no yes YES

2. Fights.

NO! no yes YES

3. Lots of empty or abandoned buildings.

NO! no yes YES

4. Lots of graffiti.

NO! no yes YES!

5. I feel safe in my neighborhood.

NO! no yes YES!

COMMUNITY

1. Construct: **Youth Participation**
2. Name and Description of Instrument: **Student Survey of Risk and Protective Factors/Opportunities for Prosocial Involvement**
3. Construct Definition according to Instrument
4. Reliability: 0.74
5. Validity:
6. Population instrument has been used with (demographics of target group): 6-12th Graders
7. Populations instrument has been used with and associated psychometric data:
Age Group/Ethnic Group/Gender/Geographic

Normed with different ethnic populations
8. Respondent: Self
9. Ease of use/scoring: 4-point Likert scale
10. Number of items in scale: 6
11. Mode of Administration: Pencil and Paper self-report
12. Strength of relationship to ATOD and other problem behaviors
13. Source: Contact Author or CSAP Project Officer
14. Author: M. Arthur, J. Pollard, J. Hawkins and R. Catalano
15. Availability: Public Domain
16. Cost: None
17. Copyright: None
18. Citation Information (abstracts, where used)

COMMUNITY

Opportunities for Prosocial Involvement Scale:

1. There are lots of adults in my neighborhood I could talk to about something important.

NO! no yes YES!

Which of the following activities for people your age are available in your community?

- | | | | |
|----|----------------------|-----|----|
| 2. | Sports Teams | Yes | No |
| 3. | Scouting | Yes | No |
| 4. | Boys and Girls Clubs | Yes | No |
| 5. | 4-H Clubs | Yes | No |
| 6. | Service Clubs | Yes | No |

COMMUNITY

1. Construct: **Youth Participation**
2. Name and Description of Instrument: **Student Survey of Risk and Protective Factors/Rewards for Prosocial Involvement**
3. Construct Definition according to Instrument
4. Reliability: 0.89
5. Validity:
6. 6. Population instrument has been used with (demographics of target group): 6th -12th grades
7. Populations instrument has been used with and associated psychometric data:
Age Group/Ethnic Group/Gender/Geographic

Normed with different ethnic populations
8. Respondent: Self
9. Ease of use/scoring: 4-point Likert scale
10. Number of items in scale: 3
11. Mode of Administration: Pencil and Paper self-report
12. Strength of relationship to ATOD and other problem behaviors
13. Source: Contact Author or CSAP Project Officer
14. Author: M. Arthur, J. Pollard, J. Hawkins and R. Catalano
15. Availability: Public Domain
16. Cost: None
17. Copyright: None
18. Citation Information (abstracts, where used)

COMMUNITY

Rewards for Prosocial Involvement Scale:

1. My neighbors notice when I am doing a good job and let me know.

NO! no yes YES!

2. There are people in my neighborhood who encourage me to do my best.

NO! no yes YES!

3. There are people in my neighborhood who are proud of me when I do something well.

NO! no yes YES!

INDIVIDUAL/PEER

1. Construct: **Antisocial Attitudes**
2. Name and Description of Instrument/Scale: **Student Survey of Risk and Protective Factors/Favorable Attitudes Toward Antisocial Behavior**
3. Construct Operational Definition as used in Instrument: Assesses student's attitude toward violent behavior.
4. Reliability: 0.83
5. Validity: High concurrent validity with drug and alcohol use and delinquency.
6. Target Population: General population of students in 6th, 8th, 10th, and 12th
7. Populations instrument has been used with and associated psychometric data:
Age Group/Ethnic Group/Gender/Geographic

Normed with different ethnic populations
8. Respondent: Self
9. Ease of use/scoring: Four-point scale (Very wrong to Not wrong at all)
10. Number of items in scale: 5
11. Mode of Administration: Pencil and Paper self-report
12. Strength of relationship to ATOD and other problem behaviors:
13. Source: Contact Author or CSAP Project Officer
14. Author: Arthur, Hawkins, Catalano and Pollard
15. Availability: Public Domain
16. Cost: None
17. Copyright: Public Domain
18. Citation Information (abstracts, where used)

INDIVIDUAL/PEER

Favorable Attitudes Toward Antisocial Behavior Scale:

1. How wrong do you think it is for someone your age to take a handgun to school?
Very wrong Wrong A little bit wrong Not wrong at all
2. How wrong do you think it is for someone your age to steal anything worth more than \$5?
Very wrong Wrong A little bit wrong Not wrong at all
3. How wrong do you think it is for someone your age to pick a fight with someone?
Very wrong Wrong A little bit wrong Not wrong at all
4. How wrong do you think it is for someone your age to attack someone with the idea of seriously hurting them?
Very wrong Wrong A little bit wrong Not wrong at all
5. How wrong do you think it is for someone your age to stay away from school all day when their parents think they are at school?
Very wrong Wrong A little bit wrong Not wrong at all

INDIVIDUAL/PEER

1. Construct: **Antisocial Attitudes**
2. Name and Description of Instrument/Scale: **Student Survey of Risk and Protective Factors/Belief in the Moral Order**
3. Construct Operational Definition as used in Instrument: Assesses student's attitude toward morality issues through their reactions to specific scenarios.
4. Reliability: 0.73
5. Validity: High concurrent validity with drug and alcohol use and delinquency.
6. Target Population: General population of students in 6th, 8th, 10th, and 12th
7. Populations instrument has been used with and associated psychometric data:
Age Group/Ethnic Group/Gender/Geographic

Normed with different ethnic populations
8. Respondent: Self
9. Ease of use/scoring: Four-point scale (NO! to YES!)
10. Number of items in scale: 4
11. Mode of Administration: Pencil and Paper self-report
12. Strength of relationship to ATOD and other problem behaviors:
13. Source: Contact Author or CSAP Project Officer
14. Author: Arthur, Hawkins, Catalano and Pollard
15. Availability: Public Domain
16. Cost: None
17. Copyright: Public Domain
18. Citation Information (abstracts, where used)

INDIVIDUAL/PEER

Belief in the Moral Order Scale:

- | | | | | |
|---|-----|----|-----|------|
| 1. I think it is okay to take something without asking if you can get away with it. | NO! | no | yes | YES! |
| 2. I think sometimes it's okay to cheat at school. | NO! | no | yes | YES! |
| 3. It is all right to beat up people if they start the fight. | NO! | no | yes | YES! |
| 4. It is important to be honest with your parents, even if they become upset or you get punished. | NO! | no | yes | YES! |

INDIVIDUAL/PEER

1. Construct: **Rebelliousness/Impulsiveness**
2. Name and Description of Instrument/Scale: **Student Survey of Risk and Protective Factors/Rebelliousness**
3. Construct Operational Definition as used in Instrument: Assesses student's willingness to seek out rebellious behavior.
4. Reliability: 0.78
5. Validity: High concurrent validity with drug and alcohol use and delinquency.
6. Target Population: General population of students in 6th, 8th, 10th, and 12th
7. Populations instrument has been used with and associated psychometric data:
Age Group/Ethnic Group/Gender/Geographic

Normed with different ethnic populations
8. Respondent: Self
9. Ease of use/scoring: Four-point scale (Very false to Very true)
10. Number of items in scale: 3
11. Mode of Administration: Pencil and Paper self-report
12. Strength of relationship to ATOD and other problem behaviors:
13. Source: Contact Author or CSAP Project Officer
14. Author: Arthur, Hawkins, Catalano and Pollard
15. Availability: Public Domain
16. Cost: None
17. Copyright: Public Domain
18. Citation Information (abstracts, where used)

INDIVIDUAL/PEER

Rebelliousness Scale:

1. I do the opposite of what people tell me, just to get them mad.
Very false Somewhat false Somewhat true Very true
2. I ignore rules that get in my way.
Very false Somewhat false Somewhat true Very true
3. I like to see how much I can get away with.
Very false Somewhat false Somewhat true Very true

INDIVIDUAL/PEER

1. Construct: **Life Skills**
2. Name and Description of Instrument/Scale: **Stress Management Skills**
3. Construct Operational Definition as used in Instrument: Assesses skills needed to manage stress.
4. Reliability: 0.75
5. Validity: Not available
6. Target Population: White, African-American, Hispanic, middle school, junior high school, high school
7. Populations instrument has been used with and associated psychometric data: Age Group/Ethnic Group/Gender/Geographic
8. Respondent: Self
9. Ease of use/scoring: easy
10. Number of items in scale: 4
11. Mode of Administration: Pencil and Paper self-report
12. Strength of relationship to ATOD and other problem behaviors:
13. Source: Contact Dr. Bill Hansen
1-800-826-4539
14. Author: Hansen
15. Availability: Approved for CSAP use with source reference
16. Cost: None
17. Copyright: Tanglewood Research (formerly Wake Forest Evaluation)
18. Citation Information (abstracts, where used)

Hansen, W.B. (1997)

INDIVIDUAL/PEER

Stress Management Skills Scale:

1. I handle stress very well.

Strongly Agree Agree a little Disagree a little Strongly Disagree

2. Stressful situations are very difficult for me to deal with.

Strongly Agree Agree a little Disagree a little Strongly Disagree

3. I know how to relax when I feel too much pressure.

Strongly Agree Agree a little Disagree a little Strongly Disagree

4. I know what to do to handle a stressful situation.

Strongly Agree Agree a little Disagree a little Strongly Disagree

INDIVIDUAL/PEER

1. Construct: **Intentions/Expectations to Use**
2. Name and Description of Instrument/Scale: **Tanglewood Research Evaluation/Commitment to Not Use Drugs**
3. Construct Operational Definition as used in Instrument: Assesses commitment to not use drugs, to avoid violence, and to wait until marriage to have sex.
4. Reliability: 0.84
5. Validity: Not available
6. Target Population: White, African-American, Hispanic, middle school, junior high school, high school
7. Populations instrument has been used with and associated psychometric data: Age Group/Ethnic Group/Gender/Geographic
8. Respondent: Self
9. Ease of use/scoring: easy, sex items may be controversial
10. Number of items in scale: 8
11. Mode of Administration: Pencil and Paper self-report
12. Strength of relationship to ATOD and other problem behaviors:
13. Source: Contact Dr. Bill Hansen
1-800-826-4539
14. Author: Hansen
15. Availability: Approved for CSAP use with source citation
16. Cost: None
17. Copyright: Tanglewood Research
18. Citation Information (abstracts, where used)

Hansen, W.B. (1996)

INDIVIDUAL/PEER

Commitment to Not Use Drugs Scale:

1. I have made a final decision to stay away from marijuana.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
2. I have decided that I will smoke cigarettes.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
3. If I had the chance and knew I would not be caught, I would get drunk.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
4. I plan to get drunk sometime in the next year.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
5. I have made a promise to myself that I will not drink alcohol.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
6. I have told at least one person that I do not intend to smoke.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
7. It is clear to my friends that I am committed to living a drug-free life.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree
8. I have signed my name to a pledge saying that I will not use marijuana or drugs.
Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

INDIVIDUAL/PEER

1. Construct: **Perceived Harm/Risk**
2. Name and Description of Instrument/Scale: **Monitoring the Future/Perceived Harm**
3. Construct Operational Definition as used in Instrument: Assesses the opinions of physical harm/risk from substance abuse
4. Reliability: Not applicable
5. Validity: Perceived harm from substance use has been found to negatively relate to use and onset of use.
6. Target Population: General population of students in 8th, 10th, and 12th grades
7. Populations instrument has been used with and associated psychometric data: Age Group/Ethnic Group/Gender/Geographic

Has been normed with several subpopulations, including Whites, African-Americans and Hispanics
8. Respondent: Self
9. Ease of use/scoring: 4-point Likert scale with 'not familiar with drug' listing
10. Number of items in scale: 14
11. Mode of Administration: Pencil and Paper self-report
12. Strength of relationship to ATOD and other problem behaviors:
13. Source: Contact Author or CSAP Project Officer
14. Author: Johnston
15. Availability: Public Domain
16. Cost: None
17. Copyright: Public Domain
18. Citation Information (abstracts, where used)

INDIVIDUAL/PEER

Perceived Harm Scale:

How much do you think people risk harming themselves (physically or in other ways) if they...

1. Smoke one or more packs of cigarettes per day

- 1 No risk
- 2 Slight risk
- 3 Moderate risk
- 4 Great risk
- 5 Can't Say/Drug Unfamiliar

2. Try marijuana once or twice

- 1 No risk
- 2 Slight risk
- 3 Moderate risk
- 4 Great risk
- 5 Can't Say/Drug Unfamiliar

3. Smoke marijuana occasionally

- 1 No risk
- 2 Slight risk
- 3 Moderate risk
- 4 Great risk
- 5 Can't Say/Drug Unfamiliar

4. Smoke marijuana regularly

- 1 No risk
- 2 Slight risk
- 3 Moderate risk
- 4 Great risk
- 5 Can't Say/Drug Unfamiliar

5. Try cocaine in powder form one or twice

- 1 No risk
- 2 Slight risk
- 3 Moderate risk
- 4 Great risk
- 5 Can't Say/Drug Unfamiliar

6. Take cocaine powder occasionally

- 1 No risk
- 2 Slight risk
- 3 Moderate risk
- 4 Great risk
- 5 Can't Say/Drug Unfamiliar

7. Take cocaine powder regularly

- 1 No risk
- 2 Slight risk
- 3 Moderate risk
- 4 Great risk
- 5 Can't Say/Drug Unfamiliar

8. Try 'crack' cocaine once or twice

- 1 No risk
- 2 Slight risk
- 3 Moderate risk
- 4 Great risk
- 5 Can't Say/Drug Unfamiliar

9. Try 'crack' cocaine occasionally

- 1 No risk
- 2 Slight risk
- 3 Moderate risk
- 4 Great risk
- 5 Can't Say/Drug Unfamiliar

10. Try crack cocaine regularly

- 1 No risk
- 2 Slight risk
- 3 Moderate risk
- 4 Great risk
- 5 Can't Say/Drug Unfamiliar

11. Try one or two drinks of an alcoholic beverage (beer, wine, liquor)

- 1 No risk
- 2 Slight risk
- 3 Moderate risk
- 4 Great risk
- 5 Can't Say/Drug Unfamiliar

12. Take one or two drinks nearly every day

- 1 No risk
- 2 Slight risk
- 3 Moderate risk
- 4 Great risk
- 5 Can't Say/Drug Unfamiliar

13. Take four of five drinks nearly every day

- 1 No risk
- 2 Slight risk
- 3 Moderate risk
- 4 Great risk
- 5 Can't Say/Drug Unfamiliar

14. Have five or more drinks once or twice each weekend

- 1 No risk
- 2 Slight risk
- 3 Moderate risk
- 4 Great risk
- 5 Can't Say/Drug Unfamiliar

INDIVIDUAL/PEER

1. Construct: **Attitude Toward Use**
 2. Name and Description of Instrument/Scale: **Monitoring the Future/Disapproval of Drug Use**
 3. Construct Operational Definition as used in Instrument: Assesses student's attitudes toward using drugs.
 4. Reliability: Not Applicable
 5. Validity: Disapproval of Drug Use has been found to negatively relate to use and onset of use.
 6. Target Population: General population of students in 8th, 10th, and 12th grades
 7. Populations instrument has been used with and associated psychometric data: Age Group/Ethnic Group/Gender/Geographic
- Has been normed with several subpopulations, including Whites, African-Americans, and Hispanics
8. Respondent: Self
 9. Ease of use/scoring: 3-point Likert scale with not applicable listing
 10. Number of items in scale: 16
 11. Mode of Administration: Pencil and Paper self-report
 12. Strength of relationship to ATOD and other problem behaviors:
 13. Source: Contact Author or CSAP Project Officer
 14. Author: Johnston
 15. Availability: Public Domain
 16. Cost: None
 17. Copyright: Public Domain
 18. Citation Information (abstracts, where used)

INDIVIDUAL/PEER

Disapproval of Drug Use Scale:

Do YOU disapprove of people doing each of the following?

1. Smoking one or more packs of cigarettes per day

Don't disapprove unfamiliar	Disapprove	Strongly disapprove	Can't say or drug
--------------------------------	------------	---------------------	-------------------

2. Using smokeless tobacco regularly

Don't disapprove unfamiliar	Disapprove	Strongly disapprove	Can't say or drug
--------------------------------	------------	---------------------	-------------------

3. Trying marijuana once or twice

Don't disapprove unfamiliar	Disapprove	Strongly disapprove	Can't say or drug
--------------------------------	------------	---------------------	-------------------

4. Smoking marijuana occasionally

Don't disapprove unfamiliar	Disapprove	Strongly disapprove	Can't say or drug
--------------------------------	------------	---------------------	-------------------

5. Smoking marijuana regularly

Don't disapprove unfamiliar	Disapprove	Strongly disapprove	Can't say or drug
--------------------------------	------------	---------------------	-------------------

6. Trying cocaine in powder form once or twice

Don't disapprove unfamiliar	Disapprove	Strongly disapprove	Can't say or drug
--------------------------------	------------	---------------------	-------------------

7. Taking cocaine powder occasionally

Don't disapprove unfamiliar	Disapprove	Strongly disapprove	Can't say or drug
--------------------------------	------------	---------------------	-------------------

8. Trying 'crack' cocaine once or twice

Don't disapprove unfamiliar	Disapprove	Strongly disapprove	Can't say or drug
--------------------------------	------------	---------------------	-------------------

9. Taking 'crack' cocaine occasionally

Don't disapprove unfamiliar	Disapprove	Strongly disapprove	Can't say or drug
--------------------------------	------------	---------------------	-------------------

10. Trying one or two drinks of an alcoholic beverage (beer, wine, liquor)

Don't disapprove unfamiliar	Disapprove	Strongly disapprove	Can't say or drug
--------------------------------	------------	---------------------	-------------------

11. Taking one or two drinks nearly every day

Don't disapprove unfamiliar	Disapprove	Strongly disapprove	Can't say or drug
--------------------------------	------------	---------------------	-------------------

12. Having five or more drinks once or twice each weekend

Don't disapprove unfamiliar	Disapprove	Strongly disapprove	Can't say or drug
--------------------------------	------------	---------------------	-------------------

13. Sniffing glue, gases, or sprays once or twice

Don't disapprove unfamiliar	Disapprove	Strongly disapprove	Can't say or drug
--------------------------------	------------	---------------------	-------------------

14. Sniffing glue, gases, or sprays regularly

Don't disapprove unfamiliar	Disapprove	Strongly disapprove	Can't say or drug
--------------------------------	------------	---------------------	-------------------

15. Trying heroin once or twice without using a needle

Don't disapprove unfamiliar	Disapprove	Strongly disapprove	Can't say or drug
--------------------------------	------------	---------------------	-------------------

16. Trying heroin occasionally without using a needle

Don't disapprove unfamiliar	Disapprove	Strongly disapprove	Can't say or drug
--------------------------------	------------	---------------------	-------------------

INDIVIDUAL/PEER

1. Construct: **Attitude Toward Use**
2. Name and Description of Instrument/Scale: **Student Survey of Risk and Protective Factors/Favorable Attitudes Toward Drug Use**
3. Construct Operational Definition as used in Instrument: Assesses student's attitudes toward using drugs.
4. Reliability: 0.88
5. Validity: High concurrent validity with drug and alcohol use and delinquency.
6. Target Population: General population of students in 6th, 8th, 10th, and 12th
7. Populations instrument has been used with and associated psychometric data:
Age Group/Ethnic Group/Gender/Geographic

Normed with different ethnic populations
8. Respondent: Self
9. Ease of use/scoring: Four-point scale (Very wrong to Not wrong at all)
10. Number of items in scale: 4
11. Mode of Administration: Pencil and Paper self-report
12. Strength of relationship to ATOD and other problem behaviors:
13. Source: Contact Author or CSAP Project Officer
14. Author: Arthur, Hawkins, Catalano and Pollard
15. Availability: Public Domain
16. Cost: None
17. Copyright: Public Domain
18. Citation Information (abstracts, where used)

INDIVIDUAL/PEER

Favorable Attitudes Toward Drug Use Scale:

1. 1. How wrong do you think it is for someone your age to drink beer, wine or hard liquor (for example, vodka, whiskey or gin) regularly?

Very wrong Wrong A little bit wrong Not wrong at all

2. 2. How wrong do you think it is for someone your age to smoke cigarettes?

Very wrong Wrong A little bit wrong Not wrong at all

3. 3. How wrong do you think it is for someone your age to smoke marijuana?

Very wrong Wrong A little bit wrong Not wrong at all

4. 4. How wrong do you think it is for someone your age to use LSD, cocaine, amphetamines or another illegal drug?

Very wrong Wrong A little bit wrong Not wrong at all

INDIVIDUAL/PEER

1. Construct: **Self-esteem**
2. Name and Description of Instrument/Scale: **Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale**
3. Construct Operational Definition as used in Instruments: Assesses characteristics of self-esteem.
4. Reliability: 0.92. Test-retest has correlations of .85 and .88 over two weeks.
5. Validity: Not Available
6. Target Populations: Unspecified
7. Populations instrument has been used with and associated psychometric data:
Age Group/Ethnic Group/Gender/Geographic
Unspecified
8. Respondent: Self
9. Ease of use/scoring: Four-point scale (Strongly agree to Strongly disagree)
10. Number of items in scale: 10
11. Mode of Administration: Pencil and paper self-report
12. Strength of relationship to ATOD and other problem behaviors:
13. Source: See Citation Information
14. Author: Rosenberg
15. Availability: Public Domain
16. Cost: None
17. Copyright: Public Domain
18. Citation Information (abstracts, where used)

Rosenberg M. (1965).

INDIVIDUAL/PEER

Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale:

1. I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others.
Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree
2. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.
Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree
3. I really feel that I am a failure.
Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree
4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.
Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree
5. I do not have much to be proud of.
Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree
6. I take a positive attitude toward myself.
Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree
7. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree
8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.
Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree
9. I certainly feel useless at times.
9. Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree
10. At times I think I am no good at all.
Strongly agree Agree Disagree Strongly disagree

SCHOOL

1. Construct: **School Bonding/Commitment**
2. Name and Description of Instrument/Scale: **Student Survey of Risk and Protective Factors/Little Commitment to School**
3. Construct Operational Definition as used in Instrument: Measures low commitment to school in there of importance of school and assignments and level of interest/enjoyment in school.
4. Reliability: .76
5. Validity:
6. Target Population: General population of students in 6, 8, 10 and 12
7. Populations instrument has been used with and associated psychometric data:
Age Group/Ethnic Group/Gender/Geographic
Normed with different ethnic populations
8. Respondent: Self
9. Ease of use/scoring:
10. Number of items in scale: 5
11. Mode of Administration: Pencil and Paper self report
12. Strength of relationship to ATOD and other problem behaviors:
13. Source: Contact Author or CSAP Project Officer
14. Author: Arthur, Hawkins, Catalano and Pollard
15. Availability: Public Domain
16. Cost: None
17. Copyright: Public Domain
- 18: Citation Information (abstracts, where used)

Assorted article obtainable from Social Development Research Group
Website: <http://weber.u.washington.edu/sdrg/#mineu>
Email: sdrg@u.washington.edu

SCHOOL

School Bonding/Commitment Scale:

1. How often do you feel that the school work you are assigned is meaningful and important?

☐ Almost always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Seldom ☐ Never

2. How interesting are most of your courses to you?

☐ Very interesting and stimulating
☐ Quite interesting
☐ Fairly interesting
☐ Slightly dull
☐ Very dull

3. How important do you think things you are learning in school are going to be for your later life?

☐ Very important
☐ Quite important
☐ Fairly important
☐ Slightly important
☐ Not at all important

4. *Now thinking back over the past year in school,...*

How often did you enjoy being in school?

☐ Almost always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Seldom ☐ Never

How often did you hate being in school?

☐ Almost always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Seldom ☐ Never

How often did you try to do your best in school?

☐ Almost always ☐ Often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Seldom ☐ Never

5. *During the LAST FOUR WEEKS,...*

How many whole days have you missed because of illness?

None	1	2	3	4-5	6-10	11 or more
------	---	---	---	-----	------	------------

How many whole days have you missed because you skipped or cut?

None	1	2	3	4-5	6-10	11 or more
------	---	---	---	-----	------	------------

How many whole days have you missed for other reasons?

None	1	2	3	4-5	6-10	11 or more
------	---	---	---	-----	------	------------

SCHOOL

1. Construct: **School Grades and Records**
2. Name and Description of Instrument/Scale: **Student Survey of Risk and Protective Factors/Academic Failure**
3. Construct Operational Definition as used in Instrument: A self report of last year's grades.
4. Reliability: Not Applicable
5. Validity:
6. Target Population: General population of students in 6, 8, 10 and 12
7. Populations instrument has been used with and associated psychometric data:
Age Group/Ethnic Group/Gender/Geographic
Normed with different ethnic populations
8. Respondent: Self
9. Ease of use/scoring:
10. Number of items in scale: 1
11. Mode of Administration: Pencil and Paper self report
12. Strength of relationship to ATOD and other problem behaviors:
13. Source: Contact Author or CSAP Project Officer
14. Author: Arthur, Hawkins, Catalano and Pollard
15. Availability: Public Domain
16. Cost: None
17. Copyright: Public Domain
18. Citation Information (abstracts, where used)
Assorted article obtainable from Social Development Research Group
Website: <http://weber.u.washington.edu/sdrg/#mineu>
Email: sdrg@u.washington.edu

SCHOOL

Academic Failure SSRP Items Scale:

1. Putting them all together, what were your grades like last year?

_____ Mostly F's
_____ Mostly D's
_____ Mostly C's
_____ Mostly B's
_____ Mostly A's

SCHOOL

1. Construct: **School Safety/Dangerousness**
2. Name and Description of Instrument/Scale: **Youth Risk Behavior Survey** (Year 1997)
3. Construct Operational Definition as used in Instrument: Measures threats to safety (physical harm and property damage during school)
4. Reliability: Unknown
5. Validity:
6. Target populations:
7. Population instrument has been used with and associated psychometric data:
Age Group/Ethnic Group/Gender/Geographic

10,900 students in grades 8 to 12 (nationwide)
8. Respondent: Self
9. Ease of use/scoring:
10. Number of items in scale: 4
11. Mode of Administration: Pencil and Paper self report
12. Strength of relationship to ATOD and other problem behaviors: Undetermined
13. Source: Center for Disease Control
14. Author: C/O Laura Kahn, Ph.D.
Center for Disease Control
Division of Adolescent and School Health
Mailstop K-33
4700 Buford Highway, N.E.
Atlanta, GA 30341
15. Availability: Contact the CDC
16. Cost: None
17. Copyright: Public Domain

18. Citation Information (abstracts, where used)
Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report-Assorted years
Center for Disease Control
Website: <http://www.cdc.gov/epo/mmwr/mmwr.html>

SCHOOL

School Safety/Dangerousness Scale:

1. During the past 30 days, how many days did you **not** go to school because you felt you would be unsafe at school or on your way to or from school?
 - 1 0 days
 - 2 1 day
 - 3 2 or 3 days
 - 4 4 or 5 days
 - 5 6 or more days
2. During the past 12 months, how many times has someone threatened or injured you with a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club on school property?
 - 1 0 times
 - 2 1 time
 - 3 2 or 3 times
 - 4 4 or 5 times
 - 5 6 or 7 times
 - 6 8 or 9 times
 - 7 10 or 11 times
 - 8 12 or more times
3. During the past 12 months, how many times has someone stolen or deliberately damaged your property such as your car, clothing, or books on school property?
 - 1 0 times
 - 2 1 time
 - 3 2 or 3 times
 - 4 4 or 5 times
 - 5 6 or 7 times
 - 6 8 or 9 times
 - 7 10 or 11 times
 - 8 12 or more times
4. During the past 12 months, how many times were you in a physical fight on school property?
 - 1 0 time
 - 2 1 time
 - 3 2 or 3 times
 - 4 4 or 5 times
 - 5 6 or 7 times
 - 6 8 or 9 times
 - 7 10 or 11 times
 - 8 12 or more times

SCHOOL

1. Construct: **Education Expectations and Aspirations**
2. Name and Description of Instrument/Scale: **Monitoring the Future**
3. Construct Operational Definition as used in Instrument: Students' self-expectations for post-secondary education.
4. Reliability: Not Applicable
5. Validity:
6. Target Population: General population of students in 6, 8, 10 and 12
7. Populations instrument has been used with and associated psychometric data:
Age Group/Ethnic Group/Gender/Geographic

Normed with different populations
8. Respondent: Self
9. Ease of use/scoring: 4-point Likert scale
10. Number of items in scale: 5
11. Mode of Administration: Pencil and Paper self-report
12. Strength of relationship to ATOD and other problem behaviors:
13. Source: Contact Author or CSAP Project Officer
14. Author: Johnston
15. Availability: Public Domain
16. Cost: None
17. Copyright: Public Domain
18. Citation Information (abstracts, where used)

SCHOOL

Education Expectations and Aspirations Scale:

How likely is it that you will do each of the following things after high school?

1. Attend a technical or vocational school.
 - 1 Definitely won't
 - 2 Probably won't
 - 3 Probably will
 - 4 Definitely will
2. Serve in the armed forces.
 - 1 Definitely won't
 - 2 Probably won't
 - 3 Probably will
 - 4 Definitely will
3. Graduate from a two-year college program.
 - 1 Definitely won't
 - 2 Probably won't
 - 3 Probably will
 - 4 Definitely will
4. Graduate from a college (four-year program).
 - 1 Definitely won't
 - 2 Probably won't
 - 3 Probably will
 - 4 Definitely will
5. Attend graduate or professional school after college.
 - 1 Definitely won't
 - 2 Probably won't
 - 3 Probably will
 - 4 Definitely will

SCHOOL

1. Construct: **Parent-School Involvement**
2. Name and Description of Instrument/Scale: **Parent Involvement in School Interview**
3. Construct Operational Definition as Used in Instrument: Inquires about parents involvement/monitoring of son/daughters school activities (e.g., tests, homework, classes, after school).
4. Reliability: 0 .86
5. Validity
6. Target population: Designed for Grades 5 thru 12
7. Population instrument has been used with and associated psychometric data: Age group/Ethnic Group/Geographic
8. Respondent: Parent
9. Ease of use/scoring:
10. Number of items in scale: 6
11. Mode of Administration: Pencil and paper self report
12. Strength of relationship to ATOD and other problem behaviors: Undetermined
13. Source: Unknown
14. Author: Unknown—contact Resnicow
15. Availability:
16. Cost: None
17. Copyright: Unknown
18. Citation Information (abstracts, where used)

SCHOOL

Parent-School Involvement Scale:

During the last 6 months, about how often did you:

1. Check your son's/daughter's homework after it was completed?
☐ Never ☐ Once or Twice ☐ Sometimes ☐ Regularly ☐ Very Often
2. Help your son or daughter do his or her homework?
☐ Never ☐ Once or Twice ☐ Sometimes ☐ Regularly ☐ Very Often
3. Help your son or daughter prepare for tests?
☐ Never ☐ Once or Twice ☐ Sometimes ☐ Regularly ☐ Very Often
4. Talk with your son or daughter about his or her experience at school with classes or class work that day?
☐ Never ☐ Once or Twice ☐ Sometimes ☐ Regularly ☐ Very Often
5. Talk with your son or daughter about his or her experience at school with friends or other school children that day?
☐ Never ☐ Once or Twice ☐ Sometimes ☐ Regularly ☐ Very Often
6. Talk with your son or daughter about his or her experience with other school activities (sports, lunch time) that day?
☐ Never ☐ Once or Twice ☐ Sometimes ☐ Regularly ☐ Very Often

FAMILY

1. Construct: **Parenting Practices (Student Instrument)**
2. Name and Description of Instrument/Scale: **Student Survey of Risk and Protective Factors/Poor Family Management**
3. Construct Operational Definition as used in Instrument: Includes likelihood of being caught by parents in antisocial behavior, parents monitoring of respondent's whereabouts and the setting of clear rules.
4. Reliability: 0.79
5. Validity: High concurrent validity with drug and alcohol use and delinquency
6. Target populations: General population of students in grades 6, 8, 10 and 12
7. Populations instrument has been used with and associated psychometric data:
Age Group/Ethnic Group/Gender/Geographic

Normed with different ethnic populations
8. Respondent: Self
9. Ease of use/scoring: Straightforward 4 point (NO! no yes YES!)
10. Number of items in scale: 6
11. Mode of Administration: Pencil and paper self report
12. Strength of relationship to ATOD and other problem behaviors:
13. Source: Contact Author or CSAP Project Officer
14. Author: Arthur, Hawkins, Catalano and Pollard
15. Availability: Public Domain
16. Cost: None
17. Copyright: Public Domain
18. Citation Information (abstracts, where used)—Liddle, H.A. (1998), SAMHSA/CSAP (1995), SAMHSA/CSAP (1998)

FAMILY

Parenting Practices (Student Instrument)

Poor Family Management Scale:

- | | | | | | |
|----|--|-----|----|-----|------|
| 1. | My parents ask if I've gotten my homework done. | NO! | no | yes | YES! |
| 2. | My parents want me to call if I'm going to be late getting home. | NO! | no | yes | YES! |
| 3. | Would your parents know if you did not come home on time? | NO! | no | yes | YES! |
| 4. | When I am not at home, one of my parents knows where I am and who I am with. | NO! | no | yes | YES! |
| 5. | The rules in my family are clear. | NO! | no | yes | YES! |
| 6. | My family has clear rules about alcohol and drug abuse. | NO! | no | yes | YES! |

FAMILY

1. Construct: **Parent/Child Bonding (Parent Instrument)**
2. Name and Description of Instrument/Scale: **Parent-Child Affective Quality/Parent Report**
3. Construct Operational Definition as used in Instrument: Measures parent's positive reinforcement/affection. Also includes items on responses to child's misconduct.
4. Reliability: 0.84 - 0.86
5. Validity: Unavailable
6. Target populations: Parents
7. Populations instrument has been used with and associated psychometric data: Age Group/Ethnic Group/Gender/Geographic
8. Respondent: Parent
9. Ease of use/scoring: 7-point Likert scale
10. Number of items in scale: 7
11. Mode of Administration: Self
12. Strength of relationship to ATOD and other problem behaviors:
13. Source: Spoth and Redmond
14. Author:
15. Availability:
16. Cost: None
17. Copyright: Public Domain
18. Citation Information (abstracts, where used)

Liddle, H.A. (1998)

FAMILY

Parent/Child Bonding (Parent Instrument)

Parent-Child Affective Quality Parent Report

1. During the past month, when you and your child have spent time talking or doing things together, how often did you:

	ALWAYS	<u>Almost Always</u>	<u>Fairly Often</u>	<u>About Half the Time</u>	<u>Not too Often</u>	<u>Almost Never</u>	<u>Never</u>
a. Get angry at him or her	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
b. Let this child know you really care about him/her	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
c. Shout or yell at this child because you were mad at him/her	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
d. Act loving and affectionate toward him/her	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
e. Let this child know that you appreciate him/her, his/her ideas or things he/she does	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
f. Yell, insult or swear at him/her when you	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

disagreed

g. When this
child does
something
wrong, how
often do you
lose your
temper and
yell at him or
her

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

FAMILY

1. Construct: **Family Involvement**
2. Name and Description of Instrument/Scale: **Student Survey of Risk and Protective Factors/Rewards for Prosocial Involvement Scales**
3. Construct Operational Definition as used in Instrument: Measures opportunities and rewards for family involvement and parental interaction.
4. Reliability: 0.86
5. Validity: High concurrent validity with drug and alcohol use and delinquency
6. Target populations: General population of students in grades 6, 8, 10 and 12
7. Populations instrument has been used with and associated psychometric data:
Age Group/Ethnic Group/Gender/Geographic

Normed with different ethnic populations
8. Respondent: Self
9. Ease of use/scoring:
10. Number of items in scale: 4
11. Mode of Administration: Pencil and paper self report
12. Strength of relationship to ATOD and other problem behaviors:
13. Source: Contact Author or CSAP Project Officer
14. Author: Arthur, Hawkins, Catalano and Pollard
15. Availability: Public Domain
16. Cost: None
17. Copyright: Public Domain
18. Citation Information (abstracts, where used)—Liddle, H.A. (1998), SAMHSA/CSAP (1995), SAMHSA/CSAP (1998)

FAMILY

Family Involvement

Rewards for Prosocial Involvement Scale:

1. My parents notice when I am doing a good job and let me know about it.
___ Never or Almost Never ___ Sometimes ___ Often ___ All the Time
2. How often do your parents tell you they're proud of you for something you've done?
___ Never or Almost Never ___ Sometimes ___ Often ___ All the Time
3. Do you enjoy spending time with your mother? NO! no yes YES!
4. Do you enjoy spending time with your father? NO! no yes YES!

FAMILY

1. Construct: **Family Conflict**
2. Name and Description of Instrument/Scale: **Student Survey of Risk and Protective Factors/Family Conflict**
3. Construct Operational Definition as used in Instrument: Measures arguments within the family
4. Reliability: 0.83
5. Validity: High concurrent validity with drug and alcohol use and delinquency.
6. Target populations: General population of students in grades 6, 8, 10 and 12
7. Populations instrument has been used with and associated psychometric data:
Age Group/Ethnic Group/Gender/Geographic

Normed with different ethnic populations
8. Respondent: Self
9. Ease of use/scoring: Straightforward 4 point (NO! no yes Yes!)
10. Number of items in scale: 3
11. Mode of Administration: Pencil and Paper self report
12. Strength of relationship to ATOD and other problem behaviors:
13. Source: Contact Author or CSAP Project Officer
14. Author: Arthur, Hawkins, Catalano and Pollard
15. Availability: Public Domain
16. Cost: None
17. Copyright: Public Domain
18. Citation Information (abstracts, where used)—Liddle, H.A. (1998), SAMHSA/CSAP (1995), SAMHSA/CSAP (1998)

FAMILY

Family Conflict Scale:

- | | | | |
|-----|---|-----|----|
| 1. | People in my family often insult or yell
at each other. | NO! | no |
| yes | YES! | | |
| | | | |
| 2. | People in my family have serious arguments. | NO! | no |
| yes | YES! | | |
| | | | |
| 3. | We argue about the same things in my family
over and over. | NO! | no |
| yes | YES! | | |

FAMILY

1. Construct: **Family ATOD—History of Use (Noncollege Instrument)**
2. Name and Description of Instrument/Scale: **Student Survey of Risk and Protective Factors/Family History of Antisocial Behavior**
3. Construct Operational Definition as used in Instrument: In addition to an item on if a family member has a “severe” ATOD problem, scale includes questions on siblings use of drugs and other antisocial behavior (e.g., carrying handgun, school expulsion)
4. Reliability: 0.73
5. Validity: High concurrent validity with drug and alcohol use and delinquency
6. Target populations: General population of students in grades 6, 8, 10 and 12
7. Populations instrument has been used with and associated psychometric data: Age Group/Ethnic Group/Gender/Geographic
Normed with different ethnic populations
8. Respondent: Self
9. Ease of use/scoring:
10. Number of items in scale: 6
11. Mode of Administration: Pencil and paper self report
12. Strength of relationship to ATOD and other problem behaviors:
13. Source: Contact Author or CSAP Project Officer
14. Author: Arthur, Hawkins, Catalano and Pollard
15. Availability: Public Domain
16. Cost: None
17. Copyright: Public Domain
18. Citation Information (abstracts, where used) - Liddle, H.A. (1998), SAMHSA/CSAP (1995), SAMHSA/CSAP (1998)

FAMILY

Family ATOD—History of Use (Noncollege Instrument)

Family History of Antisocial Behavior Scale:

1. Has anyone in your family ever had a severe alcohol or drug problem?
☐ No ☐ Yes
2. Have any of your brother(s) or sister(s) ever drunk beer, wine or hard liquor (for example, vodka, whiskey or gin)?
☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ I don't have any brothers or sisters
3. Have any of your brother(s) or sister(s) ever smoked marijuana?
☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ I don't have any brothers or sisters
4. Have any of your brother(s) or sister(s) ever smoked cigarettes?
☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ I don't have any brothers or sisters
5. Have any of your brother(s) or sister(s) ever taken a handgun to school?
☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ I don't have any brothers or sisters
6. Have any of your brother(s) or sister(s) ever been suspended or expelled from school?
☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ I don't have any brothers or sisters